

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_108756 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Soil Quality Indicators: A Comprehensive Review. |
| Type of the Article | Review Article |

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I like the title. Though I did not find the manuscript "comprehensive review" No. the abstract is not correct. The author must rewrite it again according to abstract's characteristics The subsections are appropriate. But the author must to discuss the topics, compare those with previous review or investigation. Not only describe things, given that the scientific community could find that information in a book. No, it is not Yes. they are. For that reason, the author must use that information to propose discussion. <p>The author must rewrite the abstract in the correct way (aim, methodology, results and conclusions of the review). The last paragraph of the introduction must describe the objectives of the review. This manuscript does not have that.</p> <p>The subsections do not have the characteristics for a review manuscript.</p> <p>The conclusions are poor. And do not invite to future studies.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | yes | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Johana Andrea Velasquez Arias |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad Nacional Abierta Y A Distancia Unad, Colombia |